

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/647,934	08/25/2003	Troy A. Dalsing	DALS001	3457	
7	590 05/16/2006	05/16/2006 EXAMINER		INER	
Troy A. Dalsing			JOHNSON, JERROLD D		
29175 Paint Mine Rd Calhan, CO 80808			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3728		
			DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Office	Action Summary	Part of	Paper No./Mail Date	20060509
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	-, — —	Interview Summary (PT Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Notice of Informal Pater Other:	·	52)
Attachment(s)				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	•			
 Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bure 	-		n this National St	age
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		- *	<u></u>	
1. Certified copies of the priority docume				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	•	,		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	ın priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the	attached Office Ac	tion or form PTO	-152.
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	- · ·	•	, ,	1.121(d).
Applicant may not request that any objection to th		-		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac		ected to by the Exa	miner.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner			
Application Papers		•		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election require	ment.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-40</u> is/are rejected.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	awn trom consider	ation.		
4) Claim(s) <u>21-40</u> is/are pending in the application		-4*		
Disposition of Claims				
·			 • .	
closed in accordance with the practice under	<u>*</u>	•		101113 I3
3) Since this application is in condition for allow			cution as to the m	nerits is
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) Th 	<i>April 2006.</i> is action is non-fina	٠ اد		
·	A: 1 0000			
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).				
 WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail 	DATE OF THIS CO .136(a). In no event, howe d will apply and will expire tte, cause the application to	MMUNICATION. Iver, may a reply be timely to SIX (6) MONTHS from the in become ABANDONED (3)	iled mailing date of this comn 5 U.S.C. § 133).	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP	LY IS SET TO EXP	PIRE 3 MONTH(S)	OR THIRTY (30)	DAYS.
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	opears on the cover	sheet with the corr	espondence addre	ess
	Jerrold Johnson	37	⁷ 28	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	A	rt Unit	
	10/647,934	.	ALSING ET AL.	
	Application No.	^	pplicant(s)	

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment is non-responsive due to the lack of any attempt to point out the patentable novelty. Per MPEP 714.04, the Examiner has examined the amended claims, despite the non-responsiveness of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-28 and 30-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muckenhirn EP 416164 in view of Kroupa US 6,435,339, Ostrowsky US 4,487,324 and May US 5,456,375.

Muckenhirn discloses the concept of a base unit 8 to which contact lens chambers are attached through the resilient snap fit of anchor tabs 6 into openings within the base unit.

Muckenhirn does not disclose a lid connected to the chamber through a flexible member (hinge), but instead discloses lids with a threaded connection to the chamber.

Kroupa discloses that threaded lids and hinged lids are known to be interchangeable in contact lens cases.

Application/Control Number: 10/647,934

Art Unit: 3728

Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the suitability of a hinged lid for the container arrangement of Muckenhirn in place of his threaded lids.

Muckenhirn also does not disclose a tamper evident tear strip on his container assembly.

Bennett US 5,224,593 provides extrinsic evidence that tamper proof tear strips are known to be used in contact lens container.

Ostrowsky discloses the arrangement of a tear strip on a hinged lid where the lid includes a plurality of strip lock tabs, and the tear strip is disposed so that a plurality of openings are created between the tear strip and the remainder of the assembly. The tear strip prevents the tampering through the lid from being opened by someone other than the purchaser.

May in Figs. 13a-13d shows how the tear strip of Ostrowsky could also have been made with openings directly in the tear strip instead of being created by the tear strip. The tear strip arrangement of Man and Ostrowsky are equivalents of each other as they perform the identical function in substantially the same way so as to achieve substantially the same result.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the contact lens container of Muckenhirn with a hinged lid and tear strip arrangement as is disclosed by Kroupa in view of the teachings of Ostrowsky and May, along with the teachings of the extrinsic evidence of Bennett, so as to prevent unwanted tampering of the container.

Application/Control Number: 10/647,934

Art Unit: 3728

Re claim 22 and 23, Muckenhirn discloses a reverse of this arrangement.

Re claim 24, a threaded attachment of the chamber to the base unit is equivalent to that shown by Muckenhirn (snap fit).

Re claim 25-28 and 30, such agents and materials, shapes (concave and convex) and seals are all well know to be used in contact lens containers.

Re claim 31, the strength of the lid/chamber connection is a result effective variable that would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize. Specifically, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a contact lens container is subject to sterilization and needs to be built so as to accommodate this process.

Re claim 32-40, see the rejections above, as all of the subject matter set forth in these claims is noted within the above rejections.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muckenhirn EP 416164 in view of Kroupa US 6,435,339, Ostrowsky US 4,487,324 and May US 5,456,375 and further in vie of Haggin US 2004/0173474.

Muckenhirn EP 416164 in view of Kroupa US 6,435,339, Ostrowsky US 4,487,324 and May US 5,456,375 does not disclose a lid lock.

Haggin discloses a lid lock 102,114 in a hinged lid of a contact lens container.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify container of Muckenhirn et al. with the teachings of Haggin of a lid lock so as to allow the user to secure the lid on the chamber.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerrold Johnson whose telephone number is 571-272-7141. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 to 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on 571-272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/647,934

Art Unit: 3728

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDJ /

Supervisory Patent Examiner Group 3700 Page 6